IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE AT NASHVILLE

KAYLA GORE; JASON SCOTT; L.G.; and K.N.,)	
Plaintiffs,)	
v.)	No. 3:19-cv-00328
WILLIAM BYRON LEE, in his official capacity as Governor of the State of Tennessee; and LISA PIERCEY, in her official capacity as Commissioner of the Tennessee Department of Health,))))	Judge Eli J. Richardson Magistrate Judge Barbara D. Holmes
Defendants.)	

DEFENDANTS' RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS' NOTICE OF SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITY

Defendants respectfully submit their response to Plaintiffs' Notice of Supplemental Authority about *Bostock v. Clayton Cty., Ga.,* 140 S. Ct. 1731 (2020).

In *Bostock*, the Supreme Court narrowly held that "an employer who fires someone simply for being homosexual or transgender has discharged or otherwise discriminated against that individual 'because of such individual's sex'" as that term—"discriminate against"—is used in a particular provision of Title VII. *Bostock* at 1753. In reaching that conclusion, the Court found that "discrimination based on homosexuality or transgender status necessarily entails discrimination based on sex; the first cannot happen without the second." *Id.* at 1747. Here, Plaintiffs urge this Court to extend *Bostock* to their Equal Protection claims. The *Bostock* decision, however, said nothing about the Equal Protection Clause of the Constitution. In fact, the Court expressly declined to extend its decision "beyond Title VII to other federal or state laws that

prohibit sex discrimination" and to "other policies and practices" *Id.* at 1753. Indeed, the Court specifically stated that the "only question" at issue was "whether an employer who fires someone simply for being homosexual or transgender has discharged or otherwise discriminated against that individual 'because of such individual's sex' in violation of Title VII. *Id.* In other words, the *Bostock* decision does not alter the constitutional analysis that is required in this case.

In any event, even if *Bostock*'s reasoning extended to the Equal Protection Clause, that would not help Plaintiffs because they have failed to establish the threshold element of unequal treatment. As the State has explained in its previous briefing, no one is allowed to change the sex designation on a Tennessee birth certificate unless it was recorded incorrectly at the time of birth. Plaintiffs are seeking preferential treatment, not equal treatment.

Plaintiffs' reliance on Justice Alito's dissenting opinion in *Bostock* is also misplaced. A dissenting opinion of course does not establish the holding of a case. Nor is it appropriate to rely on a dissenting opinion to determine the meaning of the majority opinion. *See*, *e.g.*, *United States v. Travers*, 514 F.2d 1171. 1174 (2d Cir. 1974) (Friendly, J.) (cautioning that "Cassandra-like predictions in dissent are not a sure guide to the breadth of the majority's ruling").

1

¹ Defendants' briefing includes their Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint (Doc. 65), Memorandum of Law in Support of Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint (Doc. 66), and their response to Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. 85). Defendants respectfully request that this Court treat their Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint as a Motion for Summary Judgment pursuant to Fed. R. Civ P. 12(d). Specifically, Defendants ask that the Court consider their Response to Plaintiffs' Statement of Material Facts (Doc. 86) and Statement of Additional Facts (Doc. 87)—"matters outside the pleadings"—in support of their Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint to ensure that proper relief is granted to Defendants under Fed. R. Civ. P. 56. Defendants do not submit any additional legal authorities as matters of law have been fully briefed in the above filings.

Respectfully Submitted,

s/Dianna Baker Shew_

DIANNA BAKER SHEW BPR 012793
Senior Assistant Attorney General
(615) 532-1969
dianna.shew@ag.tn.gov
SARA E. SEDGWICK BPR 004336
Senior Assistant Attorney General
(615) 532-2589
sara.sedgwick@ag.tn.gov
Attorneys for Defendants
P.O. Box 20207
Nashville, TN 37202

Counsel for the Defendants

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on July 20, 2020 I served the foregoing *Response to Plaintiffs' Notice of Supplemental Authority* via email on the following:

John T. Winemiller (TN 021084)

MERCHANT & GOULD

9717 Cogdill Road, Suite 101

Knoxville, TN 37932 Phone: (865) 380-5960 Facsimile: (612) 332-9081 JWinemiller@merchantgould.com

Gavin R. Villareal Maddy Dwertman BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

98 San Jacinto Boulevard, Suite 1500

Austin, TX 78701-4078 Phone: (512) 322-2500 Facsimile: (512) 322-2501 maddy.dwertman@bakerbotts.com

Brandt Thomas Roessler BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. 30 Rockefeller Plaza New York, NY 10112-4498

Phone (212) 408-2500 Facsimile: (212) 408-2501

brandt.roessler@bakerbotts.com

Kathryn S. Christopherson BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

1001 Page Mill Rd., Bldg. One, Suite 200

Palo Alto, CA 94304-1007 Phone: (650) 739-7500 Facsimile: (650) 739-7699

kathryn.christopherson@bakerbotts.com

Omar Gonzalez-Pagan

LAMBDA LEGAL DEFENSE AND EDUCATION

FUND, INC.

120 Wall Street, 19th Floor New York, NY 10005-3919 Telephone: (212) 809-8585 Facsimile: (212) 809-0055 ogonzalez-pagan@lambdalegal.org

LAMBDA LEGAL DEFENSE AND EDUCATION

FUND, INC.

Tara L. Borelli

730 Peachtree Street NE, Suite 640

Atlanta, GA 30318-1210 Telephone: (404) 897-1880 Facsimile: (404) 897-1884 tborelli@lambdalegal.org

Sasha Buchert

LAMBDA LEGAL DEFENSE AND EDUCATION

FUND, INC.

1776 K Street NW, Suite 722 Washington, DC 20006 Telephone: (202) 804-6245 sbuchert@lambdalegal.org

s/ Dianna Baker Shew

Dianna Baker Shew